



UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE
United States Patent and Trademark Office
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS
P.O. Box 1450
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
-----------------	-------------	----------------------	---------------------	------------------

09/760,947

01/16/2001

Irving R. Safra

00-40324-US

4766

7066

7590

09/09/2004

REED SMITH LLP
2500 ONE LIBERTY PLACE
1650 MARKET STREET
PHILADELPHIA, PA 19103

EXAMINER

DIVINE, LUCAS

ART UNIT

PAPER NUMBER

2624

DATE MAILED: 09/09/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

Office Action Summary

Application No.

09/760,947

Applicant(s)

SAFRA ET AL.

Examiner

Lucas Divine

Art Unit

2624

-- The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

Period for Reply

A SHORTENED STATUTORY PERIOD FOR REPLY IS SET TO EXPIRE 3 MONTH(S) FROM THE MAILING DATE OF THIS COMMUNICATION.

- Extensions of time may be available under the provisions of 37 CFR 1.136(a). In no event, however, may a reply be timely filed after SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- If the period for reply specified above is less than thirty (30) days, a reply within the statutory minimum of thirty (30) days will be considered timely.
- If NO period for reply is specified above, the maximum statutory period will apply and will expire SIX (6) MONTHS from the mailing date of this communication.
- Failure to reply within the set or extended period for reply will, by statute, cause the application to become ABANDONED (35 U.S.C. § 133). Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of this communication, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

Status

- 1) ☒ Responsive to communication(s) filed on 16 January 2001.
- 2a) ☐ This action is **FINAL**. 2b) ☒ This action is non-final.
- 3) ☐ Since this application is in condition for allowance except for formal matters, prosecution as to the merits is closed in accordance with the practice under *Ex parte Quayle*, 1935 C.D. 11, 453 O.G. 213.

Disposition of Claims

- 4) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are pending in the application.
- 4a) Of the above claim(s) _____ is/are withdrawn from consideration.
- 5) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are allowed.
- 6) ☒ Claim(s) 1-56 is/are rejected.
- 7) ☐ Claim(s) _____ is/are objected to.
- 8) ☐ Claim(s) _____ are subject to restriction and/or election requirement.

Application Papers

- 9) ☐ The specification is objected to by the Examiner.
- 10) ☒ The drawing(s) filed on 16 January 2001 is/are: a) ☐ accepted or b) ☒ objected to by the Examiner.
Applicant may not request that any objection to the drawing(s) be held in abeyance. See 37 CFR 1.85(a).
Replacement drawing sheet(s) including the correction is required if the drawing(s) is objected to. See 37 CFR 1.121(d).
- 11) ☐ The oath or declaration is objected to by the Examiner. Note the attached Office Action or form PTO-152.

Priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119

- 12) ☐ Acknowledgment is made of a claim for foreign priority under 35 U.S.C. § 119(a)-(d) or (f).
- a) ☐ All b) ☐ Some * c) ☐ None of:
- ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received.
 - ☐ Certified copies of the priority documents have been received in Application No. _____.
 - ☐ Copies of the certified copies of the priority documents have been received in this National Stage application from the International Bureau (PCT Rule 17.2(a)).

* See the attached detailed Office action for a list of the certified copies not received.

Attachment(s)

- | | |
|--|---|
| 1) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Notice of References Cited (PTO-892) | 4) <input type="checkbox"/> Interview Summary (PTO-413)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date. _____ |
| 2) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Draftsperson's Patent Drawing Review (PTO-948) | 5) <input type="checkbox"/> Notice of Informal Patent Application (PTO-152) |
| 3) <input checked="" type="checkbox"/> Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449 or PTO/SB/08)
Paper No(s)/Mail Date <u>2</u> . | 6) <input type="checkbox"/> Other: _____ |

DETAILED ACTION

Priority

1. The information disclosure statement (IDS) submitted on 1/16/2001 was filed after the mailing date of the application on 1/16/2001. The submission is in compliance with the provisions of 37 CFR 1.97. Accordingly, the information disclosure statement is being considered by the examiner.

Drawings

2. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference characters **"120" on page 10 line 15** and **"122" in Fig. 1** have both been used to designate a **transmitter/receiver**.

3. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character **"128"** has been used to designate both a **cellular network on page 10 line 22** and a **processor on page 11 line 16** of the specification.

4. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(4) because reference character **"138"** has been used to designate both a **operating software on page 11 line 19** and a **facsimile machine on page 12 line 7** of the specification and because **"138"** is **referring to two different devices in Fig. 1**.

5. The drawings are objected to under 37 CFR 1.83(a). The drawings must show every feature of the invention specified in the claims. Therefore, **the cellular network discussed on page 10 line 22 of the specification and in claim 37** must be specifically shown or the

Art Unit: 2624

feature(s) canceled from the claim(s). Please correct the specification and the drawings accordingly. No new matter should be entered.

6. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they do not include the following reference sign(s) mentioned in the description: **114 as discussed in page 8 line 3 and 124 as discussed in page 10 line 18** of the specification.

7. The drawings are objected to as failing to comply with 37 CFR 1.84(p)(5) because they include the following reference character(s) not mentioned in the description: **430**.

Corrected drawing sheets in compliance with 37 CFR 1.121(d) are required in reply to the Office action to avoid abandonment of the application. Any amended replacement drawing sheet should include all of the figures appearing on the immediate prior version of the sheet, even if only one figure is being amended. The figure or figure number of an amended drawing should not be labeled as "amended." If a drawing figure is to be canceled, the appropriate figure must be removed from the replacement sheet, and where necessary, the remaining figures must be renumbered and appropriate changes made to the brief description of the several views of the drawings for consistency. Additional replacement sheets may be necessary to show the renumbering of the remaining figures. The replacement sheet(s) should be labeled "Replacement Sheet" in the page header (as per 37 CFR 1.84(c)) so as not to obstruct any portion of the drawing figures. If the changes are not accepted by the examiner, the applicant will be notified and informed of any required corrective action in the next Office action. The objection to the drawings will not be held in abeyance.

Claim Rejections - 35 USC § 103

8. **Note:** Applicant has chosen to be their own lexicographer and stated that *the term "document" as used herein refers to a unit of information* on page 7 line 3. Accordingly, the examiner has reviewed the claims with said definition in mind.

The following is a quotation of 35 U.S.C. 103(a) which forms the basis for all obviousness rejections set forth in this Office action:

(a) A patent may not be obtained though the invention is not identically disclosed or described as set forth in section 102 of this title, if the differences between the subject matter sought to be patented and the prior art are such that the subject matter as a whole would have been obvious at the time the invention was made to a person having ordinary skill in the art to which said subject matter pertains. Patentability shall not be negated by the manner in which the invention was made.

9. Claims 1, 4 – 9, 11 – 30, 32 – 36, and 39 – 56 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk (US 5793497) in view of Wang et al. (US 6662226) hereafter referred to as Funk and Wang.

Regarding claim 1, Funk teaches **a remotely initiated document request fulfillment system, comprising:**

at least one document request device 114, the at least one document request device comprising an input device (Funk suggests request devices 114 with all standard computing components, including an input device for user interaction);

a central station 104, the central station comprising a plurality of requestable documents (shown in Fig. 2, databases 200, 202, 204, 206, and 208 include a plurality of requestable information of all kinds, col. 3 lines 39-40), **a receiver** (shown in its connections for transmitting and receiving over the internet connection 102, col. 3 lines 53-54), **and a document deliverer** (Fig. 2 shows deliverers 214, 216, 218, in multiple formats), **wherein said**

document deliverer transmits at least one requested document to a destination according to at least one instruction of the processor, wherein the at least one instruction is according to the at least one document request communicably received at the receiver from the transmitter (col. 3 lines 56-58 and col. 5 line 38, wherein Funk teaches an overall system for providing requested information to a customer using a request device).

Funk teaches a networked communications environment for information requests and delivery. He teaches that connections 102 preferably include standard telephone lines, but may include other conventional computer connections (col. 3 lines 44-47). Funk therefore does not teach a wireless network for transmitting and receiving data, but does suggest the use of other network types for improved system benefits.

Wang teaches a networked communications environment in Fig. 1 for information requests and delivery. Wang further teaches the use of a wireless network 102 to for transmitting and receiving data between information request devices 108, 112 and central stations 120, 116, 150, 140 (col. 4 lines 11-20). Thus, information request devices communicating with said wireless network have **wireless transmitters** for communication as well.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless network connections of Wang in the networked connection system of Funk. The motivation for doing so would be to allow much greater user mobility and allow the user to be remote from the system information requests and delivery.

Regarding claim 4, which depends from claim 1, one of ordinary skill in the art would recognize the wireless network of 102 as being based on radio frequencies. Thus, the request

Art Unit: 2624

devices 108 and 112 include **radio frequency transmitters** and the central stations 120, 116, 150, and 140 include **radio frequency receivers**. The said transmitters must be at a **frequency receivable by the central stations** for disclosed network communication to take place and are therefore also taught by the references as recognized by one of ordinary skill in the art.

Regarding claim 5, which depends from claim 1, Wang further teaches that **the document request device further comprises a display device** (shown specifically in Figs. 3A-3G), **said display device for displaying information regarding documents available for request** (Fig. 3A, ref. no. 360, wherein display features information available for request), **said display device further issuing at least one user prompt** (user prompts shown in figures 3A-3G) **to enter information**. Funk further teaches this is **information identifying a destination for a requested document** (Fig. 2 and col. 4 lines 6-7, wherein the request device specifies the method, voice-mail, facsimile, or e-mail; and destination, specific user, of the requested information).

Regarding claim 6, which depends from claim 5 as it depends from claim 1, Wang further teaches the display on the information request device 112 to be **a touch sensitive flat panel display** (col. 4 line 47), **said touch sensitive flat panel display receiving input through contact between a surface of the display and a pointer 313** (shown in Fig. 3A).

Regarding claim 7, which depends from claim 6 as it depends from claims 5 and 1, Wang suggests the use of a **stylus** in the use of pointer 313.

Regarding claim 8, which depends from claim 6 as it depends from claims 5 and 1, Wang suggests the use of a **finger of an operator** in the description of the display. Wang discloses a 'touch' screen (col. 4 line 47), therefore being operable by finger touches.

Regarding claim 9, which depends from claim 1, Funk further teaches that **document deliverer comprises a facsimile transmitter**. Funk shows delivering of information requests by means of facsimile in col. 1 line 61 and Fig. 2 ref. no. 216.

Regarding claim 11, which depends from claim 1, Funk further teaches **the document deliverer comprises at least one connection 102 between the central station 104 and the Internet 106, and**

a means for generating an e-mail transmission including a copy of a requested document 214 (col. 2 line 32 and col. 3 line 66).

Regarding claim 12, which depends from claim 1, Funk further teaches that **the central station is capable of modifying a requestable document based on information associated with a request**. In col. 1 lines 63-65, Funk teaches that the user is able to cause the central station to modify requestable information based on a user request (Fig. 6 step 604). For example, a user 114 can instruct the central station 104 to change one of the selectable pieces of user information in Fig. 4-1, which would modify the requestable information presented. The user 114 also has the option of instructing the central station 104 to modify the requestable information to include added information 310 shown in Fig. 3 and discussed in col. 5 lines 6-8.

Regarding claim 13, which depends from claim 12 as it depends from claim 1, Funk further teaches that the modifiable **information is at least one geographic location to where the document is delivered** (Fields 7-12 in Fig. 4-1).

Regarding claim 14, which depends from claim 12 as it depends from claim 1, Funk further teaches that the modifiable **information associated with a request is the identity of an entity to which the document is to be delivered** (Fields 4, 5, and 6 of Fig. 4-1).

Regarding claim 15, which depends from claim 12 as it depends from claim 1, Funk further teaches that the modifiable **information associated with a request describes a transaction between a requester and a representative**. Fig. 3 ref. no. 310 shows the requestable information is modifiable based on the transaction between the requester – John as shown in the example – and the representative – Dave S. as shown in the example.

Regarding claim 16, which depends from claim 1, the document request devices 114 would have been known to include a **memory, said memory for storing an operating program for the document request device, and information identifying requestable documents**. Devices 114 can be embodied as standard personal computers, PDAs, cell phones, and the like, which were known to those of ordinary skill in the art to include memory for storing programs and data, including storing an operating program, client agent software (example in Wang col. 2 lines 4-6), and information on requested materials from central stations.

Regarding claim 17, which depends from claim 16 as it depends on claim 1, Wang further teaches that **the document request device memory is further capable of storing information identifying whether certification is required before a requested document can be transmitted to a requester**. Wang teaches the use of a login as shown in Fig. 3A. This login is certification of user identity and is stored in the device memory for transmission to the central station to verify the user before information transmission.

Regarding claim 18, which depends from claim 16 as it depends on claim 1, Funk further teaches that **document request device further comprises an interface for receiving updated operating program information, said updated information identifying requestable**

Art Unit: 2624

documents. In col. 4 lines 43-46, Funk teaches a system of sending updated lists identifying requestable information to document request devices 114 over the network interface.

Regarding claim 19, which depends from claim 1, Funk teaches the **transmission of a report to a third party** (Fig. 6 step 608, wherein the report is sent to a third party 'sender' – col. 5 lines 4-6 state that the sender is a third party), **said report informing the third party of the transmission of a requested document** (log of transaction in step 606).

Regarding claim 20, Funk and Wang teach all of the limitations of independent claim 20 as discussed in the rejection of claim 1, except for the added limitations addressed below.

Funk further teaches **at least one programmable document request device, the at least one programmable document request device including memory, a processor, a reconfigurable display, an input means, a document request device wireless transceiver, and a document request system operating program.** Devices 114 can be embodied as standard personal computers, PDAs, cell phones, and the like, which were known to those of ordinary skill in the art to include memory for storing programs and data, including storing an operating system, a processor, a reconfigurable display and input means. Wang provides examples in personal computer 124, PDA 112, and cell phone 108.

Regarding claim 21, which depends from claim 20, Funk further teaches **a list of requestable documents is stored in the document request device memory.** In col. 4 line 45, Funk discloses a list of requestable information that is sent to the user's information request device and stored in the device memory for display to the user.

Regarding claim 22, which depends from claim 21 as it depends from claim 20, Wang further teaches that **the requestable documents include documents which by regulation may**

Art Unit: 2624

not be distributed by a representative. In col. 2 lines 10-11, Wang teaches the use of encryption for sensitive – regulated – information. This encryption would prevent distribution to unauthorized personnel from the representative.

Regarding claim 23, which depends from claim 22 as it depends from claims 21 and 20, the limitations of claim 23 are the same as the limitations of rejected claims 19 and 22 and are rejected for the same reasons as claim 19 and 22.

Regarding claim 24, which depends from claim 21 as it depends from claim 20, Funk teaches **the requestable information including information that is modifiable by the central station.** This limitation is discussed in the rejection of claim 12 as it depends from claim 1. Therefore, claim 24 is rejected for the same reasons as rejected claim 12.

Regarding claim 25, which depends from claim 24 as it depends from claims 21 and 20, Funk further teaches **modifiable documents include business documents, said business documents being modifiable based on information associated with a document request.** Fig. 4-2 shows modifiable information that includes business information. The user can instruct the central station to modify requestable information as discussed in the rejection of claim 12.

Regarding claim 26, which depends from claim 25 as it depends from claim 24, 21, and 20, claim 26 includes the same limitations as rejected claim 14 which depends from claim 12 as it depends from claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claim 27, which depends from claim 25 as it depends from claim 24, 21, and 20, claim 27 includes the same limitations as rejected claim 15 which depends from claim 12 as it depends from claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 28, which depends from claim 25 as it depends from claim 24, 21, and 20, claim 28 includes the same limitations as rejected claim 14 which depends from claim 12 as it depends from claim 1 and is rejected for the same reasons.

Regarding claim 29, Funk teaches a **remotely initiated document fulfillment system, comprising:**

a plurality of document request devices (Fig. 1 ref. nos. 114) including document request software and a list of requestable documents (Fig. 3 ref. no. 306 discloses a list of requestable information displayed on a document request device);

a central station 104, the central station including a means for receiving a broadcasted document request (Fig. 2 ref. no. 212 and col. 5 line 38 and also shown in its connections for transmitting and receiving over the connection 102), a document database (Fig. 2 ref nos. 200, 202, 204, 206 and 208), a fax delivery means (Fig. 2 ref. no. 216), and an e-mail delivery means (Fig. 2 ref no. 214); and

While Funk teaches a networked communications system for information request and delivery, Funk does not specifically teach a personal digital assistant or a wireless network.

Wang teaches a networked communication system for information request and delivery including **a personal digital assistant 112, the personal digital assistant including a wireless transceiver (Fig. 1),**

a wireless communications network 102, said wireless communications network being communicably connected with a wireless transceiver of a document request device (Fig. 1), said wireless communication network further being communicably connected with the central station, said wireless communications network passing communications

Art Unit: 2624

between the central station and a document request device. Wang teaches the use of a wireless network 102 to for transmitting and receiving data between information request devices 108, 112 and central stations 120, 116, 150, 140 (col. 4 lines 11-20).

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the wireless network connections of Wang in the networked connection of Funk as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. It further would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use a personal data assistant such as in Wang as one of the document request devices of Funk. The document request devices of Funk are standard computing devices for network access. The motivation for using a personal digital assistant would have been to use a smaller and more portable document request device than the standard personal computer.

Regarding claim 30, which depends from claim 29, claim 30 has the same limitations as rejected claim 19 as it depends from claim 2 and is therefore rejected based on the rejection of claim 19.

Regarding claim 32, which depends from claim 21, claim 32 has the same limitations as rejected claim 19 as it depends from claim 2 and is therefore rejected based on the rejection of claim 19.

Regarding claim 33, claim 33 includes all of the limitations of rejected claim 31 as taught by Funk in view of Wang except for the limitation listed below. Therefore, the limitations that are the same are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in rejected claim 31.

Funk further teaches the use of the **Internet for information requests and delivery** (Fig. 1 ref. no. 106, col. 3 lines 58 and 66).

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 34, which depends from claim 33, claim 34 has the same limitations as rejected claim 19 as it depends from claim 2 and is therefore rejected based on the rejection of claim 19.

Regarding claim 35, claim 35 includes all of the limitations of rejected claim 31 as taught by Funk in view of Wang except for the limitation listed below. Therefore, the limitations that are the same are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in rejected claim 31.

Wang further teaches the use of **application specific software** (col. 2 lines 4-6) which the use of on a client device would make it an **application specific device** for use in the network system of Wang and Funk for information requests and delivery. It would have been necessary to use said application specific software in order to allow the user to complete application specific information requests.

Regarding claim 36, which depends from claim 35, claim 36 has the same limitations as rejected claim 19 as it depends from claim 2 and is therefore rejected based on the rejection of claim 19.

Regarding claim 39, all of the limitations of claim 39 are met by Funk in view of Wang and discussed in the rejections of claims 33 and 35. Therefore, claim 39 is rejected for the same reasons as rejected claims 33 and 35.

Regarding claim 40, which depends from claim 39, claim 40 has the same limitations as rejected claim 19 as it depends from claim 2 and is therefore rejected based on the rejection of claim 19.

Regarding claim 41, the structural elements of Funk in view of Wang as discussed in claim 1 perform all of the steps of method claim 41. For example:

Art Unit: 2624

Funk teaches **identifying a document being requested** (Fig. 4-1, fields 22-36, wherein the user identifies which information they request);

determining a delivery method for transmitting the desired document to a delivery destination (col. 4 lines 6-8, wherein the information request can be fulfilled in a user selected delivery means);

determining a delivery destination for delivering the desired document (col. 3 lines 66-67, wherein the delivery destinations are end-user terminals, which can be the terminal of the requesting user or the terminal of another user as shown in Fig. 3 ref. no. 310 where Dave S. 'requester' selects the user destination of John 'another user');

transmitting the document request to a central station (col. 5 line 38, wherein the request is sent by the requesting device 'customer'), **said document request identifying the requested document and the destination for the document,**

receiving said document request at a central station (Fig. 6 ref. no. 600, wherein the central station receives the request from the user);

transmitting to the document request device a verification that the document request has been received (Fig. 6 ref. nos. 606 and 608, wherein a verification is sent back to the requesting device about the reception transaction); **and**

transmitting the requested document to the delivery destination associated with the document request (col. 3 lines 56-58);

And Wang teaches **said transmission utilizing a wireless transmission from the document request device** (Fig. 1 ref. no. 102);

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 42, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 17 as it depends from the rejected claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 42. Therefore, claim 42 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 17.

Regarding claim 43, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 19 as it depends from the rejected claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 43. Therefore, claim 43 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 19. Further, this transaction report is sent out after the transmit information transaction is completed.

Regarding claim 44, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 12 as it depends from the rejected claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 44. Therefore, claim 44 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 12.

Regarding claim 45, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 15 as it depends from the rejected claims 1 and 12 perform the steps of method claim 45. Therefore, claim 45 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 15.

Regarding claim 46, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 14 as it depends from the rejected claims 1 and 12 perform the steps of method claim 46. Therefore, claim 46 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 14.

Regarding claims 47 and 48, which depend from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 9 as it depends from rejected claim 1 perform the steps of method claims 47 and 48. The facsimile transmitter of claim 9 includes the facsimile service 118 which formats the facsimile for delivery based conventional facsimile systems (col. 4 lines 9-12), including those of transmitting to a **fax machine** or transmitting the fax to an **Internet address**.

Regarding claim 49, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 11 as it depends from the rejected claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 49. Therefore, claim 49 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 11.

Regarding claim 50, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 50. For example: Wang teaches the **broadcasting the document request to a wireless communications network** (wherein device 112 or 108 broadcasts the information request to a wireless network as shown in the lightning bolt symbol between the two); and **relaying the broadcasted document request to a central station via the wireless communications network** (Fig. 1 ref. nos. 120 and 116, which represent central stations connected to the wireless communications network). Therefore claim 50 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 51, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 51. Funk teaches the use of standard **telephone network** connections for the central station (col. 3 lines 45-46) which can be included in a networking system with the wireless system of Wang as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore claim 51 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 52, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 52. Funk teaches the use of a computer network system in Fig. 1 for connecting to the central station which can be included in a networking system with the wireless system of Wang as discussed in the rejection of claim 1. Therefore claim 52 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 1.

Art Unit: 2624

Regarding claim 53, which depends from claim 52 as it depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 53. Funk teaches the use of a computer network system that is the Internet 106. Therefore claim 53 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 1.

Regarding claim 54, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 19 as it depends from the rejected claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 54. Therefore, claim 54 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 19.

Regarding claim 55, which depends from claim 54 as it depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 23 as it depends from the rejected claims 22, 21, and 20 perform the steps of method claim 55. Therefore, claim 55 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 23.

Regarding claim 56, which depends from claim 41, the structural elements of claim 19 as it depends from the rejected claim 1 perform the steps of method claim 56. For example, a **follow-up representative** is a third party. Therefore, claim 56 is rejected for the reasons stated in the rejection of claim 19.

10. Claims 2 and 3 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk and Wang as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Maeda et. al (US 6764049) hereafter referred to as Maeda.

Regarding claims 2 and 3, which depend from claim 1, Funk and Wang teach all of the limitations of parent claim 1. Information request device 108 of Wang is taught as a cellular

Art Unit: 2624

phone (col. 4 line 17). Wang therefore suggests the use of a cellular phone network to connect the cellular phone 108 to the wireless network 102.

While Funk and Wang teach networks for the request and delivery of information, the combination Funk and Wang does not specifically teach the wireless network 102 to include a **cellular phone network**, or further a **satellite cellular phone network**.

Maeda teaches using a **cellular phone network** 96 and further a **satellite cellular phone network** (satellite 90) in Fig. 13 in a networking system for the request and delivery of information.

It would have been obvious for one of ordinary skill in the art to include the satellite cellular phone network of Maeda as the cellular phone interfacing in the wireless network of Funk and Wang. The motivations for doing so would have been to allow an even greater mobility allowing the user of the information request device to be an even greater distance from the central station and to allow the information request device 108 of Wang to access the wireless network 102.

11. Claim 10 is rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk and Wang as applied to claim 1 above, and further in view of Austin (US 6701315).

Regarding claim 10, which depends from claim 1, Funk and Wang teach all of the limitations of parent claim 1. While Funk and Wang teach information request systems that include e-mail, facsimile, and voice mail delivering, the combination does not teach **means for generating a copy of a requested document, and transmitting the copy of a document to a requester via a mail service**.

Art Unit: 2624

Austin teaches an information request system (Fig. 3) for delivering information that includes e-mail, facsimile, printed copy and printed copy through mail (Fig. 6D-6E). If the preferred information delivery medium of requested information is by mail, the system of Austin performs the **generating a copy of a requested document, and transmitting the copy of a document to a requester via a mail service** seen in Fig. 6E.

It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to add the printing and mail functionality of Austin as further information delivering methods to the central station of Funk and Wang. The motivation for doing so would have been to provide delivered hard copies for viewing information, which is preferable to some requester's tastes, is immune to a computer failure problem, and can be more secure than e-mail (col. 2 lines 1-2 of Austin).

12. Claims 31, 37, and 38 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Funk, Wang, and Maeda as applied to claims 29 and 2-3 above, and further in view of Nguyen (US 5797089).

Regarding claim 31, the limitations of claim 31 are the same as the limitations of rejected independent claim 29 except for the limitations discussed below. The limitations that are the same are rejected for the same reasons as discussed in the rejected claim 29.

The combination of Funk and Wang did not disclose specifically a cellular network. Maeda discloses a cellular network for a networking system for information request and delivery. It would have been obvious to use the network of Maeda in the wireless network of Funk and Wang as discussed in the rejection of claims 2 and 3.

Art Unit: 2624

While the combination of Funk, Wang, and Maeda teaches a personal digital assistant wirelessly access the information request and delivery system and a cellular phone as a document request device to access the wireless network through a cellular connection, the combination does not teach a **personal digital assistant with a cellular transceiver** to access the cellular network.

Nguyen teaches a **personal digital assistant with a cellular transceiver** (Fig. 3 ref. no. 54 and 55, which break down the transceiving functions of transmitting and receiving into functional blocks) in his device that is has cellular phone and personal digital assistant capabilities (col. 3 lines 1-3) for accessing cellular networks for information request and delivery. It would have been obvious to one of ordinary skill in the art to use the personal digital assistant of Nguyen in the networked system of Funk, Wang, and Maeda. The motivation for doing so would have been allow users to use a single device for voice communications as well as transmitting, receiving, and displaying text and images (Nguyen col. 1 lines 23-29).

Regarding claim 37, all of the limitations of claim 37 are met by Funk, Wang, Maeda and Nguyen and discussed in the rejections of claims 31 and 35. Therefore, claim 39 is rejected for the same reasons as rejected claims 31 and 35.

Regarding claim 38, which depends from claim 37, claim 38 has the same limitations as rejected claim 19 as it depends from claim 2 and is therefore rejected based on the rejection of claim 19.

Conclusion

13. The prior art made of record and not relied upon is considered pertinent to applicant's disclosure.

Jones et al., US 6191743, 2-20-2001: teaches a PDA with a wireless transceiver and user interaction between a user and a PDA through the use of a stylus or the user's finger.

Britton, US 6591289, 7-8-2003: teaches a method of delivering formatted documents over a communications network.

Wolff, US 6738841, 5-18-2004: teaches a PDA operable to receive server documents from the server via the network.

14. Any inquiry concerning this communication or earlier communications from the examiner should be directed to Lucas Divine whose telephone number is 703-306-3440. The examiner can normally be reached on Monday - Friday, 8:00am - 4:30pm.

If attempts to reach the examiner by telephone are unsuccessful, the examiner's supervisor, David Moore can be reached on 703-308-7452. The fax phone number for the organization where this application or proceeding is assigned is 703-872-9306.

Information regarding the status of an application may be obtained from the Patent Application Information Retrieval (PAIR) system. Status information for published applications may be obtained from either Private PAIR or Public PAIR. Status information for unpublished applications is available through Private PAIR only. For more information about the PAIR system, see <http://pair-direct.uspto.gov>. Should you have questions on access to the Private PAIR system, contact the Electronic Business Center (EBC) at 866-217-9197 (toll-free).

Application/Control Number: 09/760,947

Page 22

Art Unit: 2624

Lucas Divine
Examiner
Art Unit 2624

ljd

A handwritten signature in cursive script, appearing to read "David Moore".

DAVID MOORE
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 2600